

Serial Number: 10/060,620Docket Number: 10012155-1**REMARKS**

Upon entry of this Response, claims 1-19 remain pending in the present patent application. Claims 1, 4, 6-7, 10-12, and 15-19 have been amended herein. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the following remarks.

In item 3 of the Office Action, claims 3, 9, and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In particular, the Office Action states:

"The specification does not disclose erasing the authenticated parameter table upon a successful authentication of a predefined number of unauthenticated user parameters. Instead, the specification discloses erasing data after a time-out or period of inactivity." (Office Action, page 2).

Applicants respectfully disagree. In particular, in FIG. 5, item 236, the table is reset as shown. In the specification, discussion with reference to box 236 states as follows:

"In block 236 the Request Authentication method 176 resets the user parameter table 169 by erasing any values stored therein. Then, the Request Authentication method 176 ends." (Application, page 14, paragraph 1, lines 13-15.)

Claims 3, 9, and 14 recite erasing the authenticated parameter table upon a successful authentication of a predefined number of unauthenticated user parameters. As shown with reference to the flow chart of FIG. 5, a number of authentication parameters are authenticated. When successfully authenticated, the table is reset as set forth. Accordingly, claims 3, 9, and 14 have been enabled by at least the discussion of the specification and by the flow chart of FIG. 5 as described above. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 3, 9, and 14 be withdrawn.

In item 5 of the Office Action, claims 1-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,463,474 issued to Fuh et al. (hereafter "*Fuh*"). Anticipation under §102 "requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under construction. W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Applicants note that claims 1, 7, 12, and 17-19 have been amended herein. In this respect, Applicants assert that *Fuh* fails to show or suggest each of the elements of these claims as

Serial Number: 10/060,620Docket Number: 10012155-1

amended. In addition, Applicants assert that claims 4, 6, 10, 11, 15, and 16 have been amended herein so as to be compatible with the amendments made to the amended independent claims from which they depend or to correct for formalities noted. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 1-19 be withdrawn for the reasons that follow.

To begin, claim 1, as amended provides as follows:

1. A method for parameter authentication, comprising:  
executing a plurality of authentication agents in a computer system, each of the authentication agents being configured to initiate the performance of at least one authentication task to authenticate an unauthenticated user parameter for one of a plurality of functions, each of the functions corresponding to one of the authentication agents;  
examining, for each respective one of the authentication agents, an authenticated parameter table to determine whether an unauthenticated user parameter is listed therein before each respective one of the authentication agents is employed to initiate performance of the at least one authentication task; and  
bypassing the initiation of the performance of the authentication task to authenticate the unauthenticated user parameter if the unauthenticated user parameter is listed in the authenticated parameter table.

Claims 7, 12, and 17-19 have been amended to incorporate subject matter similar in scope with that of claim 1. As set forth above, claim 1 as amended recites the step of executing a plurality of authentication agents in a computer system, where each of the authentication agents is configured to initiate the performance of an authentication task to authenticate an unauthenticated user parameters for one or a plurality of functions, each of the functions corresponding to one of the authentication agents. In addition, the authenticated parameter table is examined for each one of the authentication agents before the respective one of the authentication agents is employed to initiate the performance of the at least one authentication task. In this respect, a number of authentication agents are employed to authenticate unauthenticated parameters to provide access to specific functions with which the various authentication agents are associated. In this sense, the design of the authentication system as set forth in the instant claims is extensible in that one may advantageously provide for secure access for new functions simply by adding new authentication agents without altering any other portion of the authentication system.

Serial Number: 10/060,620Docket Number: 10012155-1

Applicants assert that *Fuh* fails to show or suggest such elements. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 1, 7, 12, and 17-19 be withdrawn. In addition, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 2-6, 8-11, and 13-16 be withdrawn as depending from claims 1, 7, or 12, respectively.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully request that all outstanding objections and rejections be withdrawn and that this application and all presently pending claims be allowed to issue. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this response, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned counsel of Applicants.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. D'Aurelio  
Reg: No. 40,977

**Thomas, Kayden, Horstemeyer  
& Risley, L.L.P.**  
100 Galleria Parkway, N.W.  
Suite 1750  
Atlanta, Georgia 30339-5948  
Phone: (770) 933-9500  
Fax: (770) 951-9300